same manner and with the same effect as if this subsection had not been enacted.

SEC. 303. PROOF OF OWNERSHIP OF CLAIMS TO CONFISCATED PROPERTY.

(a) EVIDENCE OF OWNERSHIP.—(1) In any action brought under this Act, the courts shall accept as conclusive proof of ownership a certification of a claim to ownership that has been made by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission pursuant to title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (22 U.S.C. 1643 and following).

(2) In the case of a claim that has not been certified by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission before the enactment of this Act, a court may appoint a Special Master, including the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, to make determinations regarding the amount and ownership of claims to ownership of confiscated property by the Government of Cuba. Such determinations are only for evidentiary purposes in civil actions brought under this Act and do not constitute certifications pursuant to title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949.

(3) In determining ownership, courts shall not accept as conclusive evidence of ownership any findings, orders, judgments, or decrees from administrative agencies or courts of foreign countries or international organizations that invalidate the claim held by a United States national, unless the invalidation was found pursuant to binding international arbitration to which the United States submitted the claim.

(b) AMENDMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949.—Title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (22 U.S.C. 1643 and following) is amended by adding at the end of the following new section:

''DETERMINATION OF OWNERSHIP CLAIMS REFERRED BY DISTRICT COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

''SEC. 514. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act and only for purposes of section 302 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1995, a United States district court, for fact-finding purposes, may refer to the Commission, and the Commission may determine, questions of the amount and ownership of a claim by a United States nationals (as defined in section 4 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1995, resulting from the confiscations of property by the Government of Cuba described in section 503(a), whether or not the United States national qualified as a national of the United States (as defined in section 502(1)) at the time of action by the Government of Cuba''.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or in section 514 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as added by subsection (b), shall be construed—

(1) to require or otherwise authorize the claims of Cuban nationals who became United States citizens after their property was confiscated to be included in the claims certified to the Secretary of State by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission for purposes of future negotiation and espousal of claims with a friendly government in Cuba when diplomatic relations are restored; or

(2) as superseding, amending, or otherwise altering certifications that have been made pursuant to title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 before the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 304. EXCLUSIVITY OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION CERTIFICATION PROCEDURE.

Title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949 (22 U.S.C. 1643 and following), as amended by section 303, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''EXCLUSIVITY OF FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION CERTIFICATION PROCEDURE

''SEC. 515. (a) Subject to subsection (b) neither any national of the United States who was eligible to file a claim under section 503 but did not timely file such claim under that section, nor any national of the United States (on the date of the enactment of this section) who was not eligible to file a claim under that section nor any national of Cuba, including any agency, instrumentality, subdivision, or enterprise of the Government of Cuba or any local government of Cuba in place on the date of the enactment of this section, nor any successor thereto, whether or not recognized by the United States, shall have a claim to, participate in, or otherwise have an interest in, the compensation proceeds or non-monetary compensation paid or allocated to a national of the United States by virtue of a claim certified by the Commission pursuant to section 507, nor shall any district court of the United States have jurisdiction to adjudicate any such claim.

''(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to detract from or otherwise affect any rights in the shares of capital stock of nationals of the United States owning claims certified by the Commission under section 507.''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 11, 1995, to conduct a hearing on Iran sanctions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIAN AND PACIFIC AFFAIRS

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 11, 1995, at 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

EDIBLE OIL REGULATORY REFORM ACT

● Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, the Senate received from the House today H.R. 436, the Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act. The bill would amend the Oil Production Act of 1990, or OPA–90. As chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, which has exclusive jurisdiction over OPA–90, I support the Senate's passage of H.R. 436 by unanimous consent without delay.

As a member of the Environment and Public Works Committee at the time the committee reported the bill that became OPA–90, I am well acquainted with the statute. As many of us will recall, the Congress enacted OPA–90 in the aftermath of the catastrophic *Exxon Valdez* oilspill in Prince William Sound, AK.

One of the key elements of OPA–90 requires all vessels to demonstrate a certain minimum level of financial responsibility to cover the costs of cleanup and damages in the event of an oilspill. The intent behind this requirement is to ensure that an entity that discharges oil into our natural environment pay for the costs and damages arising from the spill—not the U.S. taxpayer. This intent remains sound and should continue to inform the application of the statute.

In passing OPA–90, however, Congress did not intend to abandon the use of common sense. As the act currently stands, there is no distinction made in the financial responsibility requirements for oil-carrying vessels, regardless of the kind of oil being carried. Therefore, a vessel carrying sunflower oil is held to the same requirements under OPA–90 as a carrier of deep crude.

H.R. 436 simply recognizes that vegetable oils and animal fats are different from petroleum oils. Most important, they are different in ways that make it less likely that a spill of vegetable oil or animal fat will cause the same kind of environmental damage as would a petroleum oil spill. For example, vegetable oils and animal fats contain none of the toxic components of petroleum oil.

This is not to suggest that a spill of vegetable oil or animal fat will have no adverse environmental impacts. Experience has shown to the contrary, especially in the case of the Blue Earth River spill in Minnesota in the mid–1960's. Here it is important to note that H.R. 436 would not provide an exemption for carriers of vegetable oil or animal fats. They still would be subject to a mandatory minimum financial responsibility requirement under OPA–90.

Thus, H.R. 436 will lend more rationality to the application of OPA–90 while maintaining the fundamental integrity of the act's purpose and approach. I commend my colleagues in the House for recognizing an opportunity to improve the implementation of an environmental statute.

Finally, as chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, let me say that I appreciate the willingness of all Senators to expedite action on this bill. Without unanimous consent, H.R. 436 would have been referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works. My review of the bill has convinced me that it is a straightforward, commonsense piece of legislation on which committee hearings are unnecessary and to which I can lend my support.●

NATIONAL FIRE PREVENTION WEEK

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, this week is National Fire Prevention